THEOLOGY

VOL. LX FEBRUARY, 1957 No. 440

Editorial

THE verdict of history on last November's Franco-British action in the Middle East has been confidently appealed to both by those who approved and by those who deplored it. It is too soon yet to say what the verdict will be. So far, it may seem that the intervention did much more harm than good, but since it is impossible to say what would have happened if France and Britain had not acted as they did it is arguable that a lesser risk was taken in order to avoid a greater.

Whatever history's verdict may be, it is not too soon to reflect calmly and judiciously upon what happened and upon the various ways in which people reacted to what was done. Most natural perhaps but least laudable was the simple sentiment of gratification that the British government had at last done something positive and drastic. That sentiment nourishes counsels of desperation. The whole question should be whether what was done was the best that could be done in the circumstances.

It is misleading to say that the opponents of the Franco-British intervention stood for principle and its promoters for expediency. If the word "principle" is in place here, then the intense difference of opinion that divided men of equal moral sensibility was due to the fact that more than one principle was at stake. On the one hand, there is the conviction that international relations must be regulated by law and treaties and, in this instance, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations' Organization. It is a healthy sign that a large proportion of the British people now have this principle so deeply ingrained in their minds that they were affronted, and even passionately indignant, when their government suddenly jettisoned it. On the other hand, the principle, *pacta sunt servanda*, is not an absolute one. While it should never be overridden unadvisedly, lightly or wantonly, there are contingencies in human affairs when the cause of international justice and peace may be better served by action that involves a disregard of the letter of the law and even of obligations that have been solemnly subscribed. It is a mark of wise, indeed of great, statesmanship to be able to perceive when such a contingency has arisen and to have the moral courage to take concrete action which in the abstract would be immoral. In that event, what is done is right and not merely expedient. This also is a principle.

Whether Sir Anthony Eden and his colleagues were justified by this standard is another matter. If they were, they failed to carry with them many of their best friends abroad, and they confused the public mind by the different reasons for their action which they successively put forward, some of which were obviously in the nature

of afterthoughts. It is still uncertain what exactly they were intending to accomplish, and despite their professions of success it is impossible to believe that things worked out as they designed. Altogether, to claim that their policy was characterized by wise and great statesmanship would be far-fetched. Their critics, however, are not entitled to affect a tone of moral superiority.

Our point is that it was not a straightforward issue between virtuous idealism and vicious realism. Idealism has its vices and realism its virtues. The Christian will have a very high regard for the principles of law and order, but he will esteem scarcely less highly that gift of political insight which can take the measure of an actual situation in all its complexity and judge what action will lead to the best results on a long view and on the widest possible scale. It is not easy to see that there was anywhere a clear display of such insight in the November crisis. What we should desire for our statesmen in future is not more moral rectitude but greater political sagacity.

* * * * *

Somewhat belatedly we have been reading Dr George Macleod's notable book *Only One Way Left: Church Prospect* (Iona Community, 10s. 6d.). It is a tract for the times and for all the churches, though the Leader of the Iona Community and the Moderator-designate of the General Assembly very properly illustrates his theme with special reference to the Church of Scotland. If this theme is to be put in a nut-shell it is this: "The one remaining way for churchmen, the one way left, is to recover the full proportions of the Faith." The book is based on lectures delivered in Edinburgh and at Union Theological Seminary, New York. The spoken word (where numerous spelling mistakes do not matter) comes across with extraordinary veracity. There are passages of superb and incisive eloquence, but while Dr Macleod can seldom resist a turn of rhetoric he is always down-to-earth. Here is an all-round program for any ordinary congregation that is set upon translating into practice "the full proportions of the Faith". Incidentally, it is also the best answer we have seen to the much canvassed question: What is meant by "religionless Christianity"? Dr Macleod answers the question without asking it. We are not surprised to hear that laity who attended the lectures were in the forefront of the demand that they be published.

Paper Church

EVERYONE complains of the multiplication of forms and committees in our Paper World. There is an opportunity to reduce both in the training of ordinands.

1. A candidate must fill up a very detailed and thorough form for C.A.C.T.M., who require full letters from five referees, including usually his parish priest and his former headmaster. When, however, he applies to a bishop, and when he applies to a theological college, he may be sent two more forms to fill; if he applies to more than one bishop or more than one college, he may have a form from each. In one diocese, the grants committee was requiring a form as well as the bishop. The candidate tires of assuring one form after another that he has been born and baptized, and of explaining why he feels that he is called to the ministry; and referees who have really taken trouble once become petulant when importuned so often. No form asks for anything useful that is not by now on the C.A.C.T.M. form. One diocesan form gives the candidate, who may have read theology, the same space for a record of the books he has read as for the date of his baptism.

It seems a simple remedy that bishops and colleges should be content to see and extract the C.A.C.T.M. file. If a candidate comes to them first, why should they not even then let him do his form-filling for C.A.C.T.M.? No candidate is going to be irritated if, after that, they ask something which it did not occur to C.A.C.T.M. to ask.

2. Every candidate under forty takes the General Ordination Examination. Especially if he also has a university degree, a diocese would be justified in setting a diocesan examination only if it was manifestly a higher examination, but no deacons' examination is likely to be that, and no diocese could reasonably fail a graduate who had already passed G.O.E. As an examination, this wastes the time of the candidate and of the examining chaplains. One diocese, at least till recently, set four three-hour papers, on the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Christian Faith, and Pastoralia—three Marathons and the unknown land.

The proper remedy is adopted in two dioceses; they have no deacons' examination at all.

Other dioceses set essays, and say that they are not examinations. The best essay-writer probably becomes gospeller at the ordination—a pleasant prize, but not worth an extra essay. Their justification is that they give the diocesan director of ordinands, or the archdeacon, or the bishop, a line upon the man and upon his thinking. But are they necessary? The class which he took in his degree, and the college of which he has been a member, his marks in G.O.E. (and why does no diocese ask for these?), and the parish and vicar to whom he hopes to go, all these tell you almost all you want to know about him.

If essays are set, they should not repeat G.O.E., they ought not to fish for a man's party line, and they should not ask for his opinion about practical problems where he should not have a policy before

he has gained experience. The most inconvenient essays order the candidate to think about the subject, discuss it with others, and wait for at least a week before writing. These can take an inordinate time. In a man's last term before ordination he should ideally be free to read books which G.O.E. has given no time for, and which he is less likely to get once he is away from a college library, and to read and think along a line in which he is particularly interested, and which may stimulate him to maintain his reading and thinking after ordination. The college may not succeed in finding this bent, but is more likely to find it than examining chaplains who have not yet had a chance to study him.

3. Some dioceses also summon a candidate to a viva with the examining chaplains. It can be awkward for the College Pastoralia course when men disappear at different times during the term. It has involved a man in a day's travelling for half an hour's interview. Even less than the written work is it a test of his fitness. (The writer well remembers his own; a charming archdeacon asked him to translate a difficult passage of St Paul, which in fact defeated him, and he said so; they then chatted amicably for five minutes, and that was all.) It is also expensive, especially if he has to spend a night away; few ordinands can afford extra expense, and there is no justification for wasting the Church's hardly won money on a pointless journey.

Should we not think out afresh the purpose and even the existence of examining chaplains? They do not have to decide whether a man is to be ordained or where he is to go. The Selection Board, G.O.E., and his college supply the bishop with adequate information on which to make his decision; and the bishop with the incumbent then decides where he will best be trained. There is no case for deacons' examinations or essays. Examining chaplains should become the mentors of the junior clergy, and guide their reading in the first three years after ordination. But this essay is not concerned with how that should be done, only to insist that the place of examining chaplains is after ordination, and not before.

4. Several forms are required by the Canons of 1603, to be filled up when a man is made deacon and when he is made priest.

The Si Quis has to be read in the parish church where the man resides. Like the publication of Banns before marriage, this is meant so that his neighbours can object if he is unfit. But in these rather rootless days this is more often than not a mere form, only of interest because it adds something different to the service. It names a man whom hardly anyone present knows. For during the preceding seven years he has been at a university, away in the Forces, and at a theological college; he has only been home for part of his holidays and is not well known; if his family happen to have moved house during those seven years, he is likely to be not known at all to either the vicar or congregation of the parish in which technically he resides. And many men and their families have for one reason or another —theological, ceremonial, or personal—worshipped at a church other than their parish church; it is embarrassing to ask your unknown vicar to read this to a congregation which has never heard of you,

and it certainly does not satisfy the original purpose of the document.

5. Letters Testimonial are required from his university college. It is sometimes difficult to get these signed during Oxford and Cambridge vacations, and do modern universities make exactly this sort of provision at all? There is usually a careful note from the candidate's university tutor or supervisor, among the referees who write to C.A.C.T.M.

Letters Testimonial are also required, to be signed by three beneficed clergymen, with the countersignature of their bishop or bishops, if they are not resident in the diocese where the candidate is to be ordained. This can involve a quite lengthy correspondence, and the General Post Office is the only beneficiary. When men were coming back from overseas, they just did not know any beneficed clergy. Chaplains to the Forces, however senior, may not sign. The secretaries of the great missionary societies are not qualified by their high office to sign this document. This writer can and does sign as a merely ornamental prebendary; as a responsible Principal he, too, is incredible.

6. There is also a contract of title between the incumbent and his deacon. It is a long document, in which the candidate's name and degree have to be inserted two or three times over, and he has to promise not to take less money than the vicar says he will give. It will not be a great deal, and it will not in fact be the vicar who pays; but let that pass. This document is like the annual application for a driving licence, where the unwary continue to write a series of Yes (or is it No?) until they receive the form back again from the County Council, asking whether they really mean to say that they now have an artificial leg. If this contract of title is necessary at all, will some legal secretary say why the rigmarole cannot be simplified?

This writer submits that all these forms should go. The Si Quis and the Letters Testimonial are meant to represent the election by the laity and by the clergy. The idea is sound, the execution so flimsy that it discredits the idea. It is properly done through the careful letters written by the referees, both clerical and lay, when the man first applies; and these answers are not mere forms, like the documents which the Canons at present require, and which presuppose quite different conditions.

Until the nineteenth century, the bishop or his archdeacon examined his candidates immediately before the day of ordination, and had no previous knowledge of them. "Sometimes it happened that a man would learn on Sunday morning that he had not passed the examination, and must go home."[1] Bishop Selwyn of Lichfield and Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury set the example of ending the examination on Friday evening, and leaving Saturday clear for spiritual preparation; but only Bishop Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln actually put the examination some weeks earlier than the Ember Week, and the writer has it on first-hand authority that at Lichfield in the beginning of this century a candidate would not know till

[1] S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People*, p. 256.

Saturday morning whether he should be ordained the next day or not.

Examinations varied. Charles Perry, who became Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, in 1829, was received by the ordaining bishop[1] "with a courteous bow" and the words, "It would be quite superfluous, Mr Perry, to examine a gentleman of your well-known attainments". But the diary of a Welsh candidate in 1808 reveals that his bishop expected him first to "compose" in English and Latin; presumably this was a sermon, as the English subject was "Ye are the salt of the earth". He then had an hour's examination by the bishop himself upon the New Testament and its contents with translation from the Greek, and on another day was questioned very searchingly, as he says, about the Articles and one of the writings of Grotius. At the last stage, he was required to recite the Articles by heart; breaking down at the twentieth, he was told to do better next time, which he succeeded in doing, and was accordingly ordained the following Sunday.[2] For such a candidate G.O.E. would hold no terrors.

Neither is any diocesan deacons' examination on such a level. If a man has passed G.O.E., it is pointless that an archdeacon should examine him again, superficially, in order that he may be able to say with accuracy, "I have examined him", when he presents him to the ordaining bishop. That is a solemn nonsense. And I estimate that learned examining chaplains spend 450 scholar-hours each year on unnecessary deacons' examinations, to say nothing of the time and labour spent on travelling. Before the strike-weapon goes out of date, they should employ it in their own interests and end these papers altogether.

This clean sweep of forms and examinations in the ordinary straightforward case robs no bishop of anything essential or even important. He must assure himself that candidates have intelligence, knowledge, and character in a critical time; but these forms give him no help towards that, and there is no future for a Paper Church. The energy and wisdom of examining chaplains is required not before, but after ordination, to supplement, inform and widen the practical training which only the first incumbent can give, and to continue, not merely to repeat, what has been done in a theological college.

KENNETH HAWORTH.

A Russian Orthodox View of New Testament Textual Criticism

IN 1951 the Y.M.C.A. Press in Paris began the publication of a Russian translation of the New Testament under the auspices of a mixed commission of representatives of various Russian and non-Russian religious bodies, including the British and Foreign Bible Society.

[1] F. W. B. Bullock, *A History of Training for the Ministry, 1800–1874*, p. 73; where three similar stories will be found.

[2] From an article in *Yr Eglwysdd*, 1847, communicated to the writer by the Rev. T. E. Jenkins, through the kindness of the Principal of Lampeter.

The translator of the first volume, containing the text of Matthew, appears to have been Bishop Cassian of Paris, and the editors claimed that the Patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras, had approved the plan and given it his blessing, although no member of the Moscow jurisdiction had been invited to participate in the enterprise. This evoked sharp criticism by I. Alexeev in a note in the *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarchii* 1954 (2), 76, which was followed by a series of articles in the same journal: 1954 (3), pp. 38–50; 1954 (4), pp. 45–55; 1954 (5), pp. 38–47; 1956 (3), pp. 49–58; 1956 (4), pp. 49–58; 1956 (5), pp. 43–52. Ivanov is a professor at the Moscow Theological Academy and is well acquainted not only with the Russian but with the English, French, and German literature of his subject.

In his first article Ivanov rightly points out that the chief difference between the older and more recent textual criticism has been the importance attached by the latter to the early uncials, the papyrus fragments, and the oldest versions and patristic quotations in comparison with the great mass of minuscules, lectionaries, and late quotations. He is, however, sceptical of the critical principles in vogue among modern scholars and finds their results arbitrary, contradictory, and theologically tendentious. The approved Russian text, issued by the Holy Synod in 1862, was based on Elzevir's edition of the *textus receptus* (1633), but Ivanov regards the work of Mattheus, professor of classical literature at Moscow 1772–84, as the decisive point of divergence between the advocates of the Byzantine text and those of the early uncials and their allies. For the period following Westcott and Hort, Ivanov mentions von Soden's edition, which he regards as the first reaction against the confidence placed in ℵ B, etc., and in the Western text as preserving ancient readings rejected by the Neutral. Ivanov remains impressed by the numerical superiority of the witnesses for the Byzantine text and by the fact that it has been consistently approved by Orthodox ecclesiastical authority. He concludes with the observation: "In textual questions, as in other matters, the Orthodox theologian must be guided by the dictum: nihil aliud probamus nisi quod Ecclesia."

In his second article, Ivanov deals with the antecedents of the new Russian translation of Matthew and its textual base in Nestle's edition of 1947. He recalls the fact that the Gospel reached the Slavs and was first promulgated among them in their own language. Its earliest forms suffered at the hands of southern and western Slavs, but the text was restored to its original purity by S. Alexius, metropolitan of Moscow, who visited Constantinople in 1355 and compared the current Slavonic with the best Greek manuscripts he could find. The rendering of the Slavonic into modern Russian came later, the New Testament in 1819–21, not without the opposition of Russian ecclesiastics who regarded this innovation as a lamentable vulgarism. Furthermore, this Russian version was not an Orthodox undertaking but the work of an eclectic commission sponsored by the British and Foreign Bible Society, which at this early date had reared its ugly head on Russian soil and operated under the patronage not of the Holy Synod but of an organization known as the

Russian Bible Society, which numbered among its members Roman Catholics and Lutherans. For this reason and because of the supposed inadequacy of the translation, the work of the Russian Bible Society was terminated by authority and its version condemned.

A second attempt to produce a modern Russian New Testament was made with the approval of the Holy Synod by the learned metropolitan of Moscow, Philaret. It was based on the Byzantine text, was accurate but idiomatic, clear, and in the familiar but not colloquial style. The four principal theological colleges of the day collaborated in the task and the work was issued 1860–2. In 1903–7 it was revised at the instigation of Pobedonostsev, and a number of Slavonic words and turns of phrase were reintroduced. Here the matter rested until the emigrant group in Paris began its new work in 1951. Ivanov has a poor opinion of this production. Apart from its questionable ecclesiastical patronage from which the Moscow Patriarch and the Russian Orthodox Exarchate had been excluded, it is based on Nestle's Greek text which, in Ivanov's view, combines the disadvantages of a too radical departure from the Byzantine norm with the intrusion of alien theological motifs. There is no doubt in Ivanov's mind that the Byzantine text is the most reliable as well as the most widely supported witness to the original text, of which both the great uncials and the Western text are local perversions.

In his last three articles Ivanov attacks the problem of the Greek text, with special reference to Nestle's edition of 1952. After a detailed description of the work, to which he pays the tribute of permitting the reader to see at a glance the main types of text and their support, he reviews the current practice of determining text forms and local recensions and comparing their probable value for reconstructing the primitive text. He gives a careful account of the textual types now recognized: the Byzantine, Neutral, Western and Caesarean, with additional comments on the disputed "Alexandrian" text and the textual theories of von Soden.

Ivanov believes that most of the principles which dominate contemporary New Testament textual criticism should be reversed. He attaches great importance to the massive support provided for the Byzantine text by biblical manuscripts, lectionaries, and quotations, but pays little regard to the question of their inter-relations and descent. A thousand copies of a single manuscript still leaves the critic with only one significant witness. Lectionaries are a similar case. Over 1,600 have survived, some of respectable age, but lectionaries are secondary products and were compiled originally from manuscripts of the running text, however often they may subsequently have been copied one from another. Little is known of their earliest composition and use and the investigation of their text is only in its initial stages. It is not surprising that most of them appear to reflect some form of the Byzantine text, as biblical manuscripts of this type were the most used by the Greek Church in the Middle Ages. There is, however, clear evidence in some of the early ones of Western and Neutral readings. It is extremely improbable that these are insertions rather than survivals.

Ivanov has missed one significant point about versions, viz. that they tend in the course of their history towards a progressive approximation to the Byzantine text. The Peshitto combines Byzantine with Old Syrian elements, but it is most unlikely that a commonly accepted and widely disseminated text like the Byzantine should have been deliberately altered in an official version like the Peshitto by the introduction of Old Syriac readings. The latter are plainly survivals, not innovations. The oldest witnesses to the Georgian version, the Adysh codex and the Khanmeti fragments, present a pure Caesarean text. This is corrected in varying degrees from manuscripts of the Byzantine type in the Opiza and Tbet' manuscripts and their allies and replaced by a rendering of the Byzantine text made on Mount Athos in the eleventh century. A philological analysis of these recensions leaves no doubt that the influence of the Byzantine text upon the Georgian was progressively intrusive. It is quite impossible to reverse this assumption and make any sense of the texts themselves.

Ivanov's statements about the quotations in patristic and Byzantine authors are also deceptive. Our knowledge of the text of most post-Nicene theological writings rests on inadequate editions, many not older than the eighteenth century and based on a haphazard treatment of a random selection of manuscripts. This is the more unfortunate as the biblical text of any author is most liable to scribal emendation. What little we do know of the quotations is surprising. By no means all authors employed the Byzantine text. Chrysostom did not for Mark nor Photius for the Gospels as a whole. This suggests the possibility that although the Byzantine text was habitually used in books designed for ecclesiastical use, it was not consistently preferred by scholars and theologians. If more extensive research proves this to be the case, the term "Ecclesiastical Text" may take on a new meaning.

A further anomaly in Ivanov's case is his claim that the more polished style of the Byzantine text and its inclusion of many words and phrases omitted from the Neutral and Western texts are indications of its primitive character. He rejects out of hand the principle of *lectio difficilior* and the theory that rougher Koine readings are more likely to be primitive than their more classical and finished counterparts in the Byzantine text. On the contrary, he regards them as contaminations and intrusive vulgarisms. He is equally sceptical of expansion and conflation and regards the longer readings as the originals of which the simpler variants are abbreviations.

The immediate point of Ivanov's articles is to discredit Nestle's text on which the new Russian translation in Paris has been based. It is not likely that his views will convince Western scholars, who have simply applied to the New Testament the critical principles generally recognized to be valid in all fields of textual inquiry. It is interesting that his insistence on ecclesiastical approval should so lightly disregard the benevolent disposition of the Patriarch of Constantinople towards the Paris enterprise and that his strictures on textual criticism should so far exceed those imposed by Rome. Since

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

Trent only the Vulgate has been recognized as decisive in dogmatic exposition and debate, but this has not been taken to imply that the Vulgate invariably preserves the most primitive available reading. This is clear from Lagrange's commentaries and from Merk's admirable edition of the Greek text, examples of distinguished Roman Catholic scholarship which could be liberally multiplied. The arresting feature of Ivanov's restatement of views familiar to English readers from the works of Scrivener, Burgon, and Hoskier is not their content but their source. It is impressive that so well informed and detailed a survey of contemporary New Testament textual criticism has appeared in *Z.M.P.* For some years this periodical has concerned itself with matters of interest only to the Russian Church, and in a few cases to students of Byzantine and medieval Russian history. It has also devoted considerable space to reports on "oecumenical" enterprises and "peace" conferences initiated by Moscow for obvious political reasons. There have been signs latterly, however, of a broadening of interests, and these, like other recent changes in Russia, may be signs of the times. It is, perhaps, not too optimistic to hope that a closer rapport between Russian and Western theological scholarship may emerge and involve not merely controversial and ideological issues but also a freer and more extensive preoccupation with purely learned interests.

ROBERT P. CASEY.

James Ussher as Churchman[1]—I

"TALKING of the Irish clergy", recorded Boswell of Dr Samuel Johnson in 1770, he said: "Swift was a man of great parts and the instrument of much good to his country; Berkeley was a profound scholar as well as a man of fine imagination; but Ussher, he said, was the great luminary of the Irish church; and a greater, he added, no church could boast of, at least in modern times."[2] The worthy doctor's eulogy could be paralleled by other, more nearly contemporary estimates. Gilbert Burnet, for example, in his life of Bishop William Bedell (with whom, as will be seen hereafter, Ussher's relations were not altogether without variableness and shadow of turning) was constrained to turn aside from his proper theme to pronounce a striking panegyric on the primate. "Together with his great and vast learning, no man had a better soul and a more apostolical mind. In his conversation he expressed the true simplicity of a Christian; for passion, pride, self-will or the love of the world seemed not be so much as in his nature; so that he had all the innocency of the dove in him. He had a way of gaining people's hearts and of touching their conscience that lookt somewhat like the apostolic age

[1] Being a lecture given at Trinity College, Dublin, on Trinity Monday, 28 May 1956, as one of a series commemorating the tercentenary of the death of Archbishop Ussher.

[2] Boswell: *Life of Johnson*, edited by G. B. Hill, revised by L. F. Powell, ii, 132.

revived; he spent much of his time in those two best exercises, secret prayer and dealing with other people's consciences, either in his sermons or private discourses; and what remained he dedicated to his studies, in which those many volumes that came from him shewed a most amazing diligence and exactness, joined with great judgment. So that he was certainly one of the greatest and best men that the age, or perhaps the world, has produced."[1] It is the pardonable province of a biographer to be partial to his subject; but in the light of Burnet's unforced testimony even the superlatives of Richard Parr may not seem too exaggerated, when he describes Ussher as "a profound scholar, exactly skilled in all sorts of learning, divine and humane, or as a person of unfeigned piety and exemplary virtue and conversation, or as a subject of steady and unmovable loyalty to his Sovereign prince, or as a clergyman in all his capacity from a presbyter to a bishop and primate; so that I think of him, it may be as truly said, as of St Augustine, with a kind of admiration, *O virum, ad totius Ecclesiae publicam utilitatem, natum, factum, datumque divinitus*".[2] In contrast to these tributes there may seem somewhat surprising, perhaps also disconcerting, in the verdict of a twentieth-century church historian, Dr E. W. Watson, my own master and teacher in these studies at Oxford, on Ussher: "He stands in the first rank among scholars; he was an eager and skilful controversialist; he held the highest place in the Irish church and used his position with effect. But his controversial ardour lessened, and in some measure distorted, the results of his scholarly labours; and his ecclesiastical activity was unwise and contributed to disaster. His true life, that of the scholar at his desk, was naturally uneventful. . . . For Ussher had no great capacities as a spiritual leader, and in spite of his massive knowledge he failed to leave his mark upon the Church's structure."[3] It is a proper exercise therefore on the tercentenary of his death to determine between these divergent estimates of his achievement; and nowhere more suitably than in the College of which he is so distinguished an *alumnus*. Assuredly no place more fitting could be found for the assessment of Ussher as a churchman than this Society, in which he learned that churchmanship and from which he helped both to define and defend the *via media* of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* as he himself understood and interpreted it.

James Ussher was in some respects singularly fortunate in the circumstances of his birth and descent. For he was sprung from an Anglo-Irish stock which for nearly four centuries had given devoted and continuous service to the English administration in Dublin; and his own father and his mother's father were Masters in the Irish Court of Chancery. Moreover, the tradition of the service of God no less in church than in state was honoured in his family; for two of his uncles held successively the primatial see of Armagh; and two of his own sisters were to marry bishops. But the deep religious divi-

[1] G. Burnet: *Life of William Bedell* (1685), pp. 85–6.
[2] R. Parr: *Life of James Ussher*. Preface, p. 1 (1686).
[3] E. W. Watson: *James Ussher*, p. 59, of *Typical English Churchmen from Parker to Maurice*, edited by W. E. Collins (1902).

sions of Ireland were also reflected in his family history; for another of his uncles was a Jesuit, and his mother, after the death of her husband, likewise joined the Church of Rome. On the one hand, therefore, Ussher was sure of honourable promotion whether in state or church, provided he did not follow the Romanist line in his family; and, on the other hand, the religious tradition of his forbears ensured that he would be neither neutral nor indifferent in this vital matter, whilst his early education made certain that Calvinism would win the victory against Popery. At the age of eight he came under the influence of two Scottish teachers, James Fullerton and James Hamilton, who plied the trade of schoolmaster in Dublin, and who were afterwards to become two of the first company of five Fellows of this College. Their training in the Reformed tradition equipped Ussher to enter the College amongst its first students at the beginning of 1594, when only just past his thirteenth birthday. By a curious irony of history Ussher's entry to the College syncronized with the appointment as its Provost of Walter Travers, one of the leading presbyterian divines of the Church of England, who, after having been thwarted in his ambition to become Master of the Temple, had been deprived of his inferior office there by Whitgift, who would not allow his possession of Presbyterian orders obtained abroad to qualify for ministry in the established church in England. Instead, Burleigh provided for him in the Provostship of the recently founded Trinity College, Dublin.

The action of Ussher's family in entering him on this foundation instead of sending him to one of the English universities, was itself a singular compliment to, and evidence of confidence in, Queen Elizabeth's new College. It is interesting indeed to reflect that, if he had been sent to Cambridge, he would have been contemporaneous there with the first blast of the trumpet, which was to throw down the walls of the hitherto dominant Calvinism, and which was blown by the breath of Peter Baro, who had been trained and ordained in Geneva during the hegemony of Calvin himself. It was this portent which evoked Whitgift's famous Lambeth Articles of 1595, which were to concern Ussher later in his career. Here, however, he was sheltered from the rude winds of criticism of Calvinism, thanks to the trinity of persons, Travers, Fullerton and Hamilton. For the College had been founded to supply clergy for the Protestant church, and its teaching was primarily theological. After a brilliant undergraduate career, Ussher became a Fellow at nineteen, and the plenitude of preferments which he shortly enjoyed were a sign both of his own great abilities and of the nakedness of the land. For in 1604 he became Chancellor of St Patrick's cathedral, and at twenty-seven was appointed to the Regius Professorship of Theological Controversies (as the chair of Divinity in this College was then called). During his third visit to England in 1609, in quest of books for the College library, he was introduced to James I through the recommendation of Archbishop Bancroft, and was offered but declined the Provostship of the College. His reputation, therefore, in England as well as in Ireland stood high; and already he was laying the

foundation of that patristic learning which became one of his distinguishing characteristics. For when, at only eighteen, he crossed controversial swords with the Jesuit Fitzsymons, he was met by the Roman argument from antiquity. Thereupon he embarked upon a study of the Fathers, extending over eighteen years, of which he wrote to his uncle Richard Stanihurst of the English college at Louvain: "The principal part of my study at this time is employed in perusing the writings of the Fathers and observing out of them the doctrine of the ancient Church; wherein I find it very necessary that the reader should be thoroughly informed touching his authors, what time they lived and what works truly and what false attributed to them; either of which being mistaken, must, of course, bring great confusion in this kind of study."[1]

Before he forsook his professorship for the bishopric of Meath, however, he was involved in a more famous controversy concerning the Irish Articles of 1615. For the Irish Church, although included within the reformation which had been effected in England and possessing the same Book of Common Prayer, had nothing corresponding to the English Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion or to the recently enacted Canons of 1604. In 1615, therefore, James I determined to hold the first post-Reformation Convocation of the Irish Church in Dublin, and to deal therein with the question of articles of belief. To Ussher, as Professor of Divinity, there fell the chief part in preparing this confessional standard; and for it he has been the subject of much adverse criticism. Dr Watson, for example, writing with unusual mordancy and severity, observed that herein "he acted with grotesque unwisdom. The English Church was contented with thirty-nine; he produced a collection of one hundred and four. England had decisively rejected the Calvinism of the Lambeth Articles; Ussher inserted their teaching and made it even more drastic. He definitely asserted that the Pope is Anti-Christ. . . . But most remarkable of all was the complete silence concerning the principles of Church government. . . . It was a serious error. The Articles alienated the sympathies of the rising school in England, and did nothing to strengthen the Church in Ireland. They seemed to commit it irrevocably to Calvinism, and to stamp their author as a partisan of his teachers, Travers and Hamilton."[2] In weighing this verdict it should be remembered, however, that the contemporary Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, was himself a Calvinist in theology; that in 1618 James I was to send delegates from England to the Synod of Dort to uphold Calvinist doctrines there against an incipient Arminianism; and that these delegates accepted all the doctrinal articles agreed upon by the Synod whilst disavowing its statement of the presbyterian position in respect of ecclesiastical polity and the parity of ministers. The mere holding of Calvinist opinions concerning predestination, election and grace, therefore, would not of itself stamp Ussher as an extremist; and the issue must

[1] C. R. Elrington: *Works* of Ussher, XV. Letter I, p. 3 (n.d.).
[2] E. W. Watson: Op. cit., p. 67.

be tested by consideration of the Irish Articles of 1615, in relation to those of the Church of England.

Compared with contemporary confessional statements, alike of the Protestant and of the Roman churches, indeed, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were both modest in number and studiously moderate in tone and content. Moreover they were deliberately intended as *articuli pacis*, whose comprehensiveness might enable as large a majority as possible to subscribe them. *Per contra*, the Irish Articles, thanks to their overdefinition, were far too numerous; and where their English counterparts were comprehensive or silent, they were precise and exclusive. In great part this was due to their embodiment of those Lambeth Articles, with which Whitgift only twenty years earlier had sought to arrest the breakaway from Calvinist doctrine in Cambridge. Thus where the English Article "Of Predestination and Election" preserved a complete silence concerning the decree of reprobation, the corresponding Irish Article affirmed explicitly that "God hath predestinated some unto life and reprobated some unto death". Again, the Irish Articles asserted that the Pope is "that man of sin foretold in the Holy Scriptures"; an opinion held indeed by not a few contemporary English churchmen —and also by Newman in his young Evangelical days—but neither mentioned in the English Articles nor suitable for formal proclamation as an article of faith. Or again, even the modest references in the English Articles to the Ordinal for the consecration of archbishops and bishops and the ordering of priests and deacons, had no parallel in the Irish Articles, which contained no specification of the several degrees of the ministry of the Church. From these examples it is clear that the Irish Articles were deliberately less comprehensive and more exclusive than those of the English Church. Moreover, when the next Irish Convocation, meeting in 1634, had been compelled by the firm hand of the Lord Deputy, Strafford, to accept the English Articles in their entirety and without debate, Ussher still continued to avow that "the Articles of Religion agreed upon in our former synod, anno 1615, we let stand as they did before."[1] Accordingly he required ordinands to subscribe both sets of Articles; "probably", commented Dr Watson, "the most voluminous test of orthodoxy which has ever been imposed"!

How far did Ussher's own opinions at this time coincide with the standpoint of the Irish Articles, especially where they differed from the English? An answer to this question, even though briefly summarized, will help to delineate the chief marks of his churchmanship. So far as the doctrine of double predestination was concerned, there can be no doubt that Ussher held firmly to its implications. In his discourse of "The True Intent and Extent of Christ's Death and Satisfaction upon the Cross" in 1617, he concluded "that the Lamb of God, offering himself a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, intended by giving sufficient satisfaction to God's justice, to make the nature of man which he assumed a fit subject for mercy, and to

[1] Ussher's *Works*, XVI. Letter 201, p. 9. (15 September 1635.)

prepare a medicine for the sins of the whole world, which should be denied to none that intended to take the benefit of it; howsoever he intended not by applying this all-sufficient remedy unto every person in particular to make it effectual unto the salvation of all, or to procure thereby the actual pardon for the sins of the whole world".[1] Similarly with regard to the papacy, Ussher's interpretation of Babylon in the 17th and 18th chapters of the Book of the Revelation was that "by this great city, Babylon (the mother of all the abominations of the earth) is understood Rome"; and again "the second beast which ariseth out of the earth and the false prophet which ministereth to the second beast that goeth to destruction, by which are meant, as I conceive, *urbs Romana, imperium Romanum, pontifex Romanus* and *clerus Romanus*".[2]

But there are other and more positive statements of Ussher's doctrine of the Church to be considered, which bring him into closer harmony with contemporary English apologetic. In his *Brief Declaration of the Universality of the Church of Christ*, published in 1624, he affirmed that "thus we must conceive of the catholic church, as of one entire body, made up by the collection and aggregation of all the faithful unto the unity thereof; from which union there ariseth unto everyone of them such a relation to, and a dependence upon, the church catholic as parts use to have in respect of their whole". It was the fault and error of "the particular Church of Rome" that "not being content to be a fellow-member with the rest of the churches of Christ and to have a joint dependence with them upon the whole body of the Church Catholic, which is the mother of us all [it] will needs go out of her rank; and scorning any longer to be accounted one of the branches of the catholic church, would fain be acknowledged to be the root of it".[3] Such were the accents of Jewel and Hooker; as was Ussher's distinguishing between reform and innovation in religion. "For we bring no new faith, nor no new church. That which in the time of the ancient fathers was accounted to be truly and properly catholic, namely, that which was believed everywhere, always and by all; that in the succeeding ages hath evermore been preserved and is at this day entirely professed in our church." Similarly, "we preach no new faith, but the same catholic faith that ever hath been preached; neither was it any part of our meaning to begin a new church in these latter days of the world, but to reform the old".[4]

Among contemporary English apologists the continuity of the Church of England with the church of the early centuries and of the middle ages by the preservation of an unbroken episcopal succession was being stoutly maintained against Romanist adversaries. About a decade earlier, in 1613, Francis Mason had published *Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England*, which made the

[1] Ussher's *Works*, XII, 559.
[2] Ibid. "What is understood by Babylon", p. 540; and "What is meant by the Beast that was, and is not, and yet is; and other passages in the 17th and 18th of Revelations", p. 547.
[3] Ibid., II, pp. 476, 477–8.
[4] Ibid., pp. 493, 497.

first public use of the evidence of Matthew Parker's *Register*, giving the official record of his consecration to the see of Canterbury, in order to demolish the Nag's Head legend and to establish the fact of continuity. Ussher, however, had taken a somewhat different line in his *De continua successione et statu Ecclesiae* (published in the same year as Mason); for he sought evidences of a spiritual succession of pure doctrine in such medieval dissidents as the Albigenses and Waldenses, an apologetic line of somewhat tenuous character and not always of certain orthodoxy. During the first half of the seventeenth century, moreover, English scholarship was devoting much attention to patristic studies, particularly in relation to the First Epistle of Clement, the Epistles of Ignatius and the works of Cyprian; and from these literary and historical researches there was resulting a new emphasis upon and a firmer advocacy of episcopacy. In the later stages of his career Ussher was distinguished by his work on the Epistles of Ignatius published in 1644. The influence of these investigations on Ussher's doctrine of episcopacy and on his evaluation of the continuity thereby preserved, was seen in his *The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans*, published in 1641 and prompted by the English bishop Joseph Hall, who had himself written two years earlier his *Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted*. In weighing Ussher's doctrine of the church and ministry, therefore, it is necessary to put his later writings side by side with his earlier works, in order to ensure a comprehensive and balanced estimate of his position.

His earlier contributions indeed seemed likely to hinder his ecclesiastical preferment, precisely because of the extreme tincture of his Calvinism. In 1619, therefore, the Lord Deputy and Council in Ireland sent a special recommendation of him to the Privy Council of England; observing that the king "has been informed, that he is somewhat transported with singularities and unaptness to be conformable to the rules and orders of the Church", whereas he was in fact "a man orthodox and worthy to govern in the Church", as well as being "an excellent and painful preacher, a modest man, abounding in goodness, and his life and doctrine so agreeable as those who agree not with him, are yet constrained to love and admire him".[1] Accordingly Ussher was nominated in 1621 to the bishopric of Meath and consecrated in St Peter's Church, Drogheda, by the Primate Archbishop Hampton and the bishops of Down, Kilmore and Dromore. Four years later he was translated to Armagh and became Primate. It will be necessary next to examine how his theories of the nature of the church and its ministry were expressed in practice in his ecclesiastical administration of his diocese and province.

NORMAN SYKES.

(To be concluded.)

[1] *Works*, I, p. 51.

What is going on at Halton?

THE eyes of the Church are on Halton. That is not too great an exaggeration. Many of the English episcopate are keenly interested in it. The Bishop of New York has chosen *The Parish Comes Alive*, the new book by the vicar of Halton, Canon Ernest Southcott, as his Lent Book for 1957. Roman Catholics and Protestants from the Continent make the journey north specially to visit Halton. Theological students of every shade of churchmanship find their way there. Rumours, not all favourable, are to be picked up thousands of miles from Halton. (Said a South African priest to the writer a few days ago: "They're cheapening the sacraments there, pandering to the people, aren't they?") THEOLOGY has already published an article on Halton.[1] Now it has appeared on T.V. So there is more than one person asking: "What is going on at Halton?"

In September last, thirty undergraduates from Oxford and Cambridge spent a fortnight in Halton. It wasn't a mission, for there was no missioner. It was the continuing mission of the Church in Halton, but, so to speak, "stepped up". The "campaign", as we called it, began the first evening with thirty Home Celebrations of the Holy Communion. The Bishop of Ripon was one of the celebrants, others were priests from neighbouring parishes. Then the various congregations emerged from the homes, and converged on the parish church for the service of Commissioning by the bishop. All the congregation, as well as the undergraduates, were commissioned.

The rest of the campaign was what, roughly speaking, is Halton's regular way of life, except that two extra priests and thirty undergraduates made possible an increase in the number of the normal parish activities. On Sundays, Matins and Holy Communion, welded together, form the morning worship, and Evensong is held in a number of the homes in the parish. On weekdays during the campaign there were four Home Celebrations, then Matins, a prayer meeting, and an hour's discussion for the staff and the visitors. In the afternoon there was visiting and children's Home Meetings. In the evening there was Evensong in church, followed either by meetings of the "Intensive" House Church (members of the congregation), or of the "Extensive" House Church (members of the congregation meeting people less committed), or United Nations Association Home Meetings, or Inter-denominational Home Meetings.

There were six other important events in the campaign: the Retreat, which followed the day of the Commissioning; the inter-denominational prayer meeting for the success of the campaign, held each week in the Methodist chapel; the Public Baptism; the Healing Service, held in the context of the Parish Communion, on a Wednesday evening (the Bishop of Wakefield, the vicar, Mr Godfrey Mowatt, secretary of the Church's Council of Healing, and members of the laity all joined together in the laying on of hands); a talk by the

[1] May 1953. "The House Church", by E. W. Southcott.

local M.P. on "Colonialism", to the Parish Meeting; a final service of re-dedication.

To have taken part in such a campaign (which will no doubt set the pattern of campaigns in many another parish), to have shared in the life and thought and action of the Church in Halton, and to have discussed the campaign at length, during its progress, with the staff and the undergraduates engaged in it, many of whom were theological students, has prepared one in some measure to give a dispassionate answer to the question: "What is going on at Halton?"

The short answer to the question is simply that the Church in Halton is taking seriously the fact that it is "the Body of Christ". What has been written about Halton so far in this respect has concentrated either on the obvious relevance of St Paul's teaching on the nature of "the Body of Christ", or on the no less relevant descriptions of the Early Church in, for instance, the Acts of the Apostles. These associations are certainly striking. But even more immediately apparent is the direct reference of the life of our Lord to the life of the Church in Halton. The phrase "the extension of the Incarnation" is not always happily employed; but only such a phrase can begin to describe what is going on.

Thirty years of our Lord's life were spent at home. True, he went up to the temple and it was his custom to go to the synagogue. But in a special sense he made the home the place of his self-revelation. Here the Body of Christ grew in stature.

And in his three years of ministry it is surely significant how many times in the Gospels it is recorded that he ministered in homes. "Zacchaeus, to-day I must abide at thy house." He ate with publicans and sinners. The Last Supper he ate with the disciples in the Upper Room. And on the first Easter Day he made himself known in the breaking of bread in a home. Here the Body of Christ is found; and here, in homes, men beheld his glory.

God exposed himself in Christ in homes. Exposure in the end meant crucifixion. But he would not shield himself. His willingness to expose himself without protection was the extent of his descent to our need, and was itself the revelation of his glory. Christ among the children and the toys and the tools, making the common the place of communion. "He became like us that we might become like him."

Halton, in a unique, prophetic, and necessary fashion, is taking seriously—at the level of the parish—this Incarnational principle: "that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first . . .?" It is reminding the Church of the extent of the "descent": that it was not merely an "ecclesiastical" descent: that the Body of Christ was not first laid in the temple.

In doing this, Halton is not simply attacking the parish church—the home church has made the parish church of Halton not less but more used. Halton makes you think again "What is holiness?—holiness in the parish". It can never simply be concerned with "withdrawal", "separation". But no less can it simply be concerned with "identification". Halton in its life and worship lives within the ten-

sion of Transcendence and Immanence, of Creation and Redemption. Clearly holiness means being "made like unto his brethren", yet . . . And the yet is of supreme importance. It implies difference and distinction. There will only be that difference if there has been withdrawal. But it will only be the right withdrawal if it springs out of real identification and intends to return to an even more real identification. At Halton you live theologically. You are forced to think out again in the context of Transcendence and Immanence what is the essential "given-ness" of the sacraments. "What is the 'distinction' of priesthood?" "Why consecrate *wine*? . . . It is a 'foreign' drink, preventing identification," said an undergraduate. You rethink the Identity and the Difference of the Body of Christ. You are reminded that the Presence is in the midst as well as above and beyond.

But this theology has been rediscovered only out of pastoral concern. It is a fact that only 1 in 300 manual workers have any effective contact with the Church. There is no doubt that most people feel out of place in the church building these days. Full churches may obscure this fact. We may be blinded by the fact that "keeping the machine going" is a full-time job for most parish priests. The one in the fold may so occupy us as to leave little or no time for the ninety and nine outside. And what is certain is that even the brightest and best services within the church building will never draw in those outside. It isn't that they object to or disagree with what is done or said. It is primarily that for many and differing reasons they feel they "don't belong" in the church building. They may be wrong to feel this, but they have every reason for feeling it. And they will only become at home in the church building when they have first become at home in the community of Christians which is the Church, the Body of Christ. But if this is to be, the Church must come to them.

Actions speak louder than words. Words, particularly these days, are cheap. The action of the Holy Communion speaks louder than could any reasoned description of it. Let it only be said, therefore, that in Halton men who would never otherwise have dreamt of coming to Communion, not in church, and certainly not on a weekday, are coming—at six in the morning—to Communion in the home. Why? Because here, before their eyes, in a way which can hardly be missed, is Christ abiding in the midst of their family, in the midst of the ordinary things of life. Here is Christ exposed in the midst of bread and wine and crockery and the table-cloth; and "Jesus has come to our house!" Here they are, there he is, in the Church! Father reads the epistle. Mother offers up prayers for her home and her street, for her husband's works and the children. ". . . and are in love and charity with your neighbours . . ." says the Invitation.

In the home the Church is real, and helps the service in the church building to become a reality. And it is not only that the signs and symbols have become more real. The congregation itself has come alive. Undoubtedly the reason for the lapse of many is either that the congregation has ceased to be or never has been real to them. A congregation is often in fact too large to be personal. It provides the

devil with ample opportunity to convince people that they have really "arrived", when in fact they are shielding behind the size of the congregation, never taking real and sacrificial responsibility. But in the home church in a unique way the individual is enabled to play his part in the whole, and the whole becomes real to the individual. When the Church meets in the intimacy of the home there are quite new possibilities of revelation. At the humble level of the two or three gathered together there is the possibility of new honesty one with another.

In the "intensive" home church this can mean real discussion of difficulties in prayer, in worship, in knowledge of the faith. So prejudices go down, and the individual grows. He can be trained to be an "apostle", not simply by teaching plastered upon him, but by a real consideration of his particular problems, considered by the whole fellowship. Could not this, for instance, provide us with something of the pattern of prayer for our times for which we have been fumbling?

In the "extensive" house church a relationship can be built up with another home over a period of time, and gradually the supreme fact that the Body of Christ cares gets across. At first, all the old "chestnuts" are brought out, almost certainly. But "love never faileth". It means, of course, that the meeting of the home church must be primarily an act of love. It cannot be an act of condescension. It cannot be simply a meeting. And because there is a certain sense in which Christ is in everyone, and an even stronger sense in which everyone baptized—however lapsed—is in Christ (and most "extensive" home churches are held in the homes of the lapsed baptized), the Christ in us, we in the Body of Christ, will go out towards the Christ in friend and stranger.

The U.N.A. home meetings provide the opportunity for the Body of Christ to be associated with non-Christians in their concern for the world. Here again understanding grows.

And similarly with the inter-denominational home meetings. The Ecumenical Movement will be sterile if it remains a matter of "talks at the summit". Experience in Halton has shown not that belief becomes confused, but that desire for unity becomes urgent, and impels each Christian to understand what he believes and what other Christians believe. Again, prejudices may at first hold the field. But the continuing resolve to speak the truth in love cannot fail.

In all these ways the Body of Christ is literally exposed at the level of the house church. The tragedy of disunity becomes evident with unparalleled clarity. The weakness of the Church—its ecclesiasticism, its middle-class mediocrity, and much else—is exposed. You see the wounds in the Body: but to see those wounds is the beginning of a new healing. The Passion of the Body of Christ is to be seen at close quarters in the house church, but this is also the beginning of Resurrection.

It is easy to avoid the Passion by being fully taken up with the things that go on at the parish church. "*We* are not divided"—so why worry about divisions? "Our church is full"—so why worry that

there's not a manual worker in it: why worry that it holds only four hundred, and there are fifteen thousand outside? "The services are so beautiful"—to us.

No one need worry that what is being done at Halton is without consultation with the bishop. In no parish is a bishop more respected. The Church's disciplines have in no way been weakened. But are they not cheapening the sacraments? If the crucifixion "cheapened" God, they are. Are they not pandering to the people? If the Incarnation was God pandering to people, they are. In Halton the Body of Christ is exposed.

ERIC JAMES.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Kenneth Haworth is Principal of Wells Theological College.

Dr Casey is Fellow and Dean of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Dr Sykes is Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. Eric James is Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEMYTHOLOGIZING

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Whether the gospel can be demythologized or neo-mythologized still appears to remain an open question. What we have seen of the former so far seems ultimately to involve discarding the gospel with the myth, and samples of the latter have not been impressive. We are left with a third course, that of re-mythologizing, to use Dr Ramsey's term, by which he means that "symbols which had lost their power of appeal sometimes recover it with new force and relevance".

But before we ask how this may be done we have to ask the prior question why the original myths have lost their power of appeal. The usual plea, that we have now moved into a new kind of world, alien to that of the New Testament, is only partly convincing. A deeper reason is that we are all nauseated with words, even those of the gospel itself sometimes. They have failed us in the pulpit, they have become the instruments of anti-Christ on a world scale, and they are poured out at us in endless irresistible meaningless floods through press and radio. "Every word", says Kierkegaard, "is covered over with a leprosy of routine, and changed into a slogan", against which the mind builds up a powerful unconscious resistance.

Therefore, before the myths of the New Testament can come to life, the gospel itself must be demythologized in the only way in which it ultimately can be without being emptied of its content,

that is, in act, not in words. Before a man knows Christ, and therefore the gospel, the suffering and beauty and charity of Christ must be re-enacted and incarnate before his eyes in the person of another Christ, another Christian. When that has taken place the explanatory myths come to life, however remote they may be from contemporary experience. "In the words of the Lord are his works," says Ecclesiasticus. The works are the outcome of the words, for, as Augustine remarks, "no man does anything which he has not first said in his heart"; but the works in turn illuminate and explicate the full content of the words. Jeremy Taylor somewhere says that our Lord bound up all his teaching in a few small bundles on the cross for every man to grasp. The cross must be shown forth in its compelling power to every age, and then the embodying illustrative myths will spring to life.

Where the gospel has been demythologized with success it has been done by such men as Schweitzer, Mindszenty and Fr Huddleston, to mention but a few, for through their suffering and sacrifice and the splendour of such lives those who feel their impact are brought to the complex undifferentiated secret, undifferentiated, that is, in language and even in thought, of the forgiveness of sins, the communion of saints, and the life everlasting. Only later do the myths interpret what has happened to them. The myths themselves cannot create the experience.

The sermon which stands out most vividly in the present writer's memory is one preached on the pearl of great price. Others who heard it described it as "sacramental" in its power. Pearls were not part of our familiar experience, nor, presumably, will they ever be so, yet the imagery is for ever alive because we knew what a price the preacher had paid for his pearl. Is there not, therefore, some huge act of self-emptying which Bultmann could perform for Christ, the Church and the world, such as was asked of John Inglesant before he joined the Jesuit Order? The redemptive New Testament myths need embodying, not rewriting.

Yours, etc.,
J. K. Byrom.

Cheadle Hulme.

NEWSPAPER OR MAGAZINE

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

With reference to the interesting article on church newspapers, may I say that it would be a pity if the clergy rushed wholesale into the parish newspaper business without having experimented with their existing magazines in new ways? The circulation here (population 6,000) when I took over last May was 320; it is now over 800 and still rising. Next month we add four new pages, two of which will be featured with "splashed" headings. The possibilities seem to me to be limitless and the existing pattern quite adaptable to new

ideas. I know two church newspapers, one of which is strikingly good and with a large circulation. The other lacks something of the incisive style of writing. I think that this is the essential and that the size and shape are secondary. Let the clergy experiment freely with what they have already. A glance at any popular magazine will show them how.

Yours faithfully,
MARTIN R. TALBOT.

THE PARSONAGE,
LANGLEY PARK,
DURHAM.
12 *December* 1956.

EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The last assertion of Canon Sansbury in his letter on the Epiclesis in the Proposed Indian Prayer Book is not a thing generally agreed, i.e. that the most primitive method of consecrating going back to the Upper Room is by thanksgiving. There is the question whether the Last Supper was a celebration of the Eucharist as well as the institution of that Sacrament. There is also grave doubt whether our Lord's thanksgiving over bread and wine were more than the usual blessings at a solemn meal. The new and effective significance of the grace-loaf and the loving-cup at Christian feasting may well not have been made apparent until the words of institution. Mark can even record it so that the impression is given that first the cup was drunk and then the words of institution about it spoken. A brisk and *simpliste* appeal to Scripture right easily involves unfairness to others, concerned with other aspects of a question with which one is wrestling. It is not only the roman interpretation of the roman canon for more than a handful of centuries, but also the eucharistic rites of the reformed communions that are challenged. The manner of celebrating the Mysteries in the first century is a matter for speculation. In the second, consecration by thanksgiving may well have been widespread. It is a method of great virtue for which much can be said. But unless one is committed to this being a golden age of the Church, its mere antiquity does not secure its pre-eminence over methods whose heyday is later. Perhaps we have to face that the manner of celebrating the eucharist was not fixed by our Lord at the Last Supper, that the Spirit was to instigate a variety of methods in different ages and circumstances of varying fullness and merit, none of which is simply right and the others wrong.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT SYMNONDS.

ST MARY DE CASTRO, LEICESTER.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I cannot but be sympathetic towards Mr Westlake and Mr Ware in their difficulties over accepting the validity of intention in South Indian ordinations, but I would ask them to consider whether it is not possible for a bishop to have a valid intention in performing an ordination while at the same time holding the erroneous belief that other people may have received the same (or similar) power and authority by some other means. Would not their argument, if logically pursued, imply that all bishops who hold the "bene esse" view of episcopacy are incapable of a valid intention?

Your correspondents say of the South Indian bishops "there is no evidence that they intend to celebrate the sacrament of ordination at all". Is it no evidence if a man is questioned and cross-questioned on this point and gives clear and categorical answers to the effect that his intention is to do as the Church has ever done in her ordinations? I do not think I have myself questioned more than three South Indian bishops, but the evidence is that the answer would be the same with all the others. I must bear witness to the fact that deeply as I have disagreed with South Indian churchmen on many points and unsatisfactory as I have found their answers on some other questions, I do not believe it is possible for any honest man with any real grasp of the doctrine of intention who has discussed the matter with C.S.I. bishops, to have the slightest doubt as to the validity of their intention. This is the reverse of what I expected from my study of the scheme before C.S.I. was founded. I still feel my expectations were reasonable and logical, hence my sympathy with Mr Westlake and Mr Ware, but the fact remains that events have proved my expectations false.

I would venture to suggest to your correspondents that they might combine with any others in Oxford who share their difficulties to invite Dr Marcus Ward, late of South India and now at the Methodist College, Richmond, to meet with them and answer their questions. I have not sought Dr Ward's permission in making this suggestion, but he was a non-episcopally ordained presbyter in South India, and were he able to come to such a meeting I believe it might remove several serious misconceptions of the evidence from your correspondents' minds.

There remain serious issues about the Church of South India. It is important that we should get them straight and not remain bogged down in removable misunderstandings.

Yours faithfully,
MICHAEL BRUCE.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ORIGINALITY OF CHRIST. By Geoffrey Graystone. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

SECRETS OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. H. J. SCHONFIELD. Vallentine, Mitchell. 21s.

The important thing about Christianity is not its originality but its truth. All are agreed that many individual beliefs and practices can be paralleled in the world in which the Church was born, though there was nothing quite like the New Testament faith as a whole. Nevertheless, it has recently been argued that Christianity was unoriginal precisely at some of those points where we had believed it to be most clearly unique. It has been claimed that before the rise of Christianity the Jewish sect at Qumran, as well as resembling the Church in many details of doctrine and practice, believed in a teacher who had suffered and died—had, perhaps, even been crucified—and who was believed to have been an incarnate divine being who was to return as messiah and judge. Sometimes spectacular assertions have been made to a general public which is not in a position to distinguish between fact and hypothesis, or to check the claims made against the evidence.

This situation makes Fr Graystone's book very timely—all the more so as it is intended for ordinary intelligent readers and not just for specialists. He begins with an account of the finds near the Dead Sea and of the sect with which they are supposed to have been connected. He compares and contrasts the organization, practices and beliefs of the sect with those of the New Testament, and, finally, he discusses Mr Edmund Wilson's recent book on the Scrolls.

Fr Graystone has little difficulty in showing that superficial resemblances between the Scrolls and the New Testament often conceal radical differences. The religion of the sect was fundamentally legalistic and contrasts sharply with that of Jesus. Its hatred of outsiders is quite different from the love and universalism of the Gospels. Baptism and the Eucharist have a different ethos from that of the lustrations and sacred meals of Qumran. It has not been proved that the Teacher of Righteousness was regarded as the Messiah, far less as a divine being, or even that he suffered a violent death. One wishes, however, that Fr Graystone had tried to give a more positive account of what the sect did believe about the Teacher. He argues that it is most improbable that Jesus or even John the Baptist ever had anything to do with Qumran.

In general Fr Graystone has succeeded in making his point. But many will feel that he perhaps underestimates the cumulative evidence of similarities between Christianity and the currents of Judaism to be seen in the Scrolls. To recognize this is in no way to subvert the Christian faith. Fr Graystone might also, with profit, have discussed more fully the claim that the Qumran messiah was thought of as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53. It would not have been difficult

to show the weakness of this claim, and such a discussion would have added to the value of this most useful little book.

Mr Schonfield writes with admirable caution and a consciousness of the tentative nature of the hypotheses which he advances. This is to be welcomed because investigation of the Qumran sect is still at the stage of hypotheses rather than of assured results.

He sees the origin of the sect in pietistic circles early in the second century B.C. The Teacher of Righteousness appeared about 176 B.C. and in 159 he led his followers into voluntary exile in the land of Damascus. Some time after his death, which may have been peaceful but which was more probably violent, the sect returned to Judah. Towards the end of the first century B.C. it was believed that the Time of the End had come, and so the sect went out into the wilderness at Qumran where it took over the buildings of a former Essene settlement. There it prepared for the final consummation by writing books and storing them in jars, ready for those who would be alive when the time came. The days were prolonged but, at last, in about A.D. 73 the Romans overran Qumran.

Mr Schonfield distinguishes two Teachers of Righteousness. The first lived, as has been seen, in the early days of the sect's history. The second Teacher—referred to in the Habakkuk Commentary about A.D. 70—was not a character of past history but was expected in the future. He was, however, described in language derived from historical reminiscences of the first Teacher and from the martyr legend which had grown up round him. Mr Schonfield collects material from Jewish and Christian sources about various martyrs and tries to trace links among them.

He also claims to discover examples of a cipher of the type in which *A* stands for *Z*, *B* for *Y*, and so on. This is incapable of proof, but it could conceivably be used to connect the mysterious Book of the Hagu with a root meaning "to refine", and—though improbably—to make the name Maccabee represent "The Hand of the Name". But it cannot turn Taxo of *The Assumption of Moses* into Asaph without presupposing a misunderstanding of the Greek letter *chi*, or Ebal into Shechem without omitting one letter and changing the order of the others. This theory is not, however, necessary to Mr Schonfield's thesis as a whole.

There are other questionable statements in the book. Without going into details, it may be said that the evidence adduced often seems inadequate to establish the conclusions drawn. In general, the account of the sect could be right—but so could any of a number of mutually exclusive alternatives. Yet it is always easier to be sceptical about someone else's theory than to offer a more satisfactory alternative. We are grateful to Mr Schonfield for collecting a mass of useful evidence, for offering us his interpretation, and also for his sensible and courteous recognition that others will not always accept that interpretation.

J. A. Emerton.

Cambridge.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY: AN ECUMENICAL APPROACH. By W. M. Horton. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

The possibility of ecumenical dogmatics is likely soon to become a live issue, as the revival of biblical studies and of constructive theology based upon them makes the reintroduction of dogmatics in the academic curriculum in England (it never lost its place in Scotland) seem not far beyond the horizon. It is hardly conceivable that dogmatics could again be taught on a denominational basis in the universities; one of the reasons for its present eclipse is certainly the difficulty of seeing how else it could be taught, except by turning it into a detached historical study, which is what in fact happened. The progress of the ecumenical movement opens another possibility, of studying and teaching dogmatics in a way which would retain its traditional character as a committed, believing study, and yet render it acceptable, without losing its seriousness, to members of a number of different churches. The development of an ecumenical dogmatics, committed to great precision and objectivity in its treatment of the positions of the different churches, and at the same time standing within the grand tradition of dogmatic theology as a fruit of the life of the worshipping Church, might be the missing factor which would open the way for the full theological curriculum to be taught again in the great English universities, and for dogmatics once more to be taught up to a fully academic standard.

Those who care for these matters are bound to approach a book with a title such as Dr Horton's bears with great expectancy. His avowed aim is to write an ecumenical theology, and his method is to make the fullest use of the work done by the great ecumenical conferences, and of the researches of Faith and Order, supplementing these sources where necessary with examination and quotation of the works of leading contemporary theologians. On the other hand, he modestly and wisely does not attempt, at least in the first edition of his book, to write for all areas of the world, but restricts himself to the field he knows best. He hopes to have written "a more-than-American book for Americans, and a more-than-Protestant book for Protestants". This is perhaps the reason for the sharp disappointment which the reviewer experienced in his expectations; indeed, it should prevent one who is neither an American nor in the modern sense a Protestant from judging Dr Horton's work too harshly, and by standards which did not govern his writing of it. All the same, it should be said at once that for British theologians, and more especially for Anglicans, this is not the work to vindicate ecumenical theology as more than a remote aspiration.

Dr Horton's book has a number of questionable features. His approach to systematic theology is governed by the nineteenth-century assumption that Christianity is the essence of religion, and that accordingly it will exhibit features in common with all religions, answering correctly and fully "universal ('ecumenical') human problems" which each in part wrongly or incompletely answers. Dr Horton seeks the answers to these questions by looking for "the uni-

versal ('ecumenical') Christian answer . . . so far as the Christian churches and schools of thought are now agreed". The result is that he produces a sort of theological Kinsey report—everybody does it, so it must be normal! Dr Horton's consensus is not precisely defined by the outcome of the ecumenical conferences, since he takes into account Roman Catholic views of revelation and of some other matters, and unitarian views of the Trinity, as well as extreme liberal and even naturalist positions where they are relevant. None the less, it is clear that for him the ecumenical conferences, supplemented by his own judgment of contemporary trends, have an almost normative authority in declaring the Christian consensus, somehow comparable to that of the ecumenical councils of patristic times. "If a student finds himself at odds with this ecumenical consensus, he must decide whether he is thinking superficially and provincially, or whether the flock of Christ in this generation is crowding sheeplike into some broad trail that leads to destruction." This is no doubt good advice to a student, but less convincing as a principle upon which to dismiss a theologian of the very great stature of Karl Barth, while including a careful treatment of lesser, though no doubt admirable, men such as the neo-liberal DeWolf.

The method of consensus has little value unless certain dogmatic questions have already been settled. British ecumenical theologians would leave out of the consensus unitarian and naturalist views, and would give far more weight and more careful treatment to Roman Catholic and Orthodox viewpoints. No doubt the consensus looks different from here, because we have a different view of the limits of the Church and of Christianity. Perhaps, too, it is more aristocratic than democratic to give so much weight as many of us would to individual giants like Barth, even when neither we nor "the consensus" agree with them, but in theology one man's opinion is not as good as another's. Many of us would see in such a man as Barth, although we disagree with him, a better model for ecumenical dogmatics. There we see a man writing as a firm believer in his own tradition, yet remoulding it creatively in the light of what he has learned from theologians of other churches. In the case of almost every one of the fundamental doctrines considered by Dr Horton, it is premature to speak of an ecumenical consensus. The ecumenical theologian to-day will serve the Church best by writing as a member of his own Church, while allowing his membership of the ecumenical community of theologians to enrich and correct the training his own tradition has given him. In this way he will retain the seriousness of dogmatics, while being of use also to members of other churches and traditions.

William Nicholls.

Edinburgh.

The Springs of Morality. A Catholic Symposium. Edited by John M. Todd. Burns and Oates. 30s.

The Roman Communion has the art of washing not only its dirty but also its clean linen in private. Hence, in England at least, we are

rarely permitted to share in the results of such informal group discussions as produced the essays which make up this book. They form a symposium of the papers originally delivered at a conference held at Downside Abbey in Low Week, 1955. Certainly their realistic and eirenic tone suggest that, as we are told, "the discussion of each paper developed in the context of a community at prayer". The group, whose interests and activities would seem to resemble in some ways those of the "Frontier", comprises priests and laymen from the West Country.

The essays are divided into four main categories headed "Historical Influences", "Secondary Services Contributory to the Concept and Practice of Morality", "Concrete Moral Problems", and "Moralities Outside the Church". Including introductory and concluding papers there are twenty-four in all. The reviewer can only follow his nose, so to speak, when so many paths open up before him, and even then he will be lucky not to lose the scent and go round in circles.

The thesis of Dom Illtyd Trethowan's bracing introduction on "The Philosophical Concept of Morality" is this: "We can hope to break into this iron ring (of Logical Analysis) only by persuading people to accept a theistic metaphysic . . . moral theologians try to prove too much by the appeal to natural reason". This thesis is illustrated by a careful examination of Mr Nowell Smith's position as worked out in his *Ethics*, recently published in the Pelican Series.

I greatly admired Dom Aelred Watkin's exposition of "The Middle Ages" in terms of "oneness with Christ": I should, however, like to know what, if anything, he has made of Professor Barraclough's recent devastating criticism of the traditional concept of the "Christian West". Mr Colin Clark is as astringent as ever on Economics. All H.M.I.s (and all uncritical admirers of the religious provisions of the 1944 Act—their name is Legion) should read Mr Claude Leetham's paper on "The School Teacher's Problem"—they will hate it. The Christian doctrine of marriage, together with the specifically "Western" Catholic view of divorce and contraception are most winningly expounded by Mr Trevett—and I mean this. (Interested experts, please note *Amour et Institution Familiale*, by Père Lestapis, S.J., Edition Spes, to which Mr. Trevett acknowledges his debt.) There is a fine piece of Tweedledum and Tweedledee work in complementary and realistic papers on the problems of Employer and Employee. If the book has reached the Dark Continent, Fr Jarrett-Kerr will be having a great time with Mr Dinwiddy discussing "The Writer's Problem".

A non-Catholic, Nana Kobina Nketsia IV, Paramount Chief of the English Sekondi state in the Gold Coast, ornaments the section on "Moralities Outside the Church" with a fascinating study of his own Akan people and the Nuer of the Southern Sudan—"two of the best documented peoples of Africa". "The tendency to deny moral responsibility on the one hand and to require it for political purposes on the other—is the particular moral predicament of secular society on both sides of the Iron Curtain." Thus Mr Coulson on "Secular Morality". Hooray! I am not the only Blimp left.

Spiritual directors, please note the key sentence in Dom Sebastian Moore's lyrical summary of "Christian Morality"—"It is in the body of Christ that we have that final precision in human life whereby morality is transfigured to become art."

More, please.

(But Karl Adam—*no* "s"—wrote *The Spirit of Catholicism* (p. 237, note 2). Even an Anglican knows this!)

JOHN MONTAGUE.

ST PANCRAS, LONDON.

ENGLISH AND WELSH CRUCIFIXES 670–1550. By J. E. Hunt. S.P.C.K. 25s.

The aim of this book is set out in the preface, "to gather together illustrations of the best examples of the Crucifix in England and Wales from the seventh century until the Reformation". There are thirty-nine plates, ranging from very familiar representations to comparatively obscure pieces such as the crude relief at Bettws-gwerfil-goch. There is a brief introduction, short chronological sections, and notes on the plates. Mr Hunt's interest is in the varying types of Christ, and in the posture of the figure on the Cross. There is no attempt to trace more complex iconographical problems, nor to use the survey of the material for the purposes of stylistic comparison. Dates are assigned either very broadly (MS. Arundel 60 is "of eleventh century date") or without any justificatory evidence (the large Romsey Rood "dates from early in the twelfth century"). Where curious features occur, no explanation of them is given. In the comment on the Crucifixion page from Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS. 157 (only described as Worcester Chronicle) there is the statement "St John is standing on a fish", but there is no suggestion as to the meaning of this puzzling attribute, which probably signifies the sea as opposed to the mound of earth below the Virgin. "The best examples" is a challenging phrase, when the selection does not include, for instance, the Stepney Rood, the St Swithun's, Amesbury or Evesham Psalters, or the Lee of Fareham panel. This is an unambitious book, with a useful but far from exhaustive selection of plates, and a straightforward but not very informative commentary. It serves to emphasize two points: the thoroughness with which representations of the crucifix were destroyed at the Reformation, and the many iconographical problems still unexplained in the examples that have survived in the less conspicuous medium of manuscript illumination. In the great Crucifixion page of the Amesbury Psalter, God the Father receives the spirit of the Son in the form of a dove, while below the Cross three male figures, of whom the central one must be Adam, rise from a tomb. Here there are meanings and relationships which have never been explained, and which doubtless cannot be explained without comparison with continental examples. Problems such as this, still awaiting an answer, are beyond the scope of the present volume.

It contains, however, much useful information about the history of the examples reproduced. If their origins and stylistic connexions are but little investigated, the course of their survival, the various buryings, boardings up and shiftings which they have undergone are set down with a care and detail that must be based on personal inquiries on the spot. Whatever its shortcomings, the volume is the product of devoted labour, and the author's enthusiasm is infectiously present in many of the descriptive passages.

T. S. R. Boase.

Magdalen College,
Oxford.

Hamann-Studien. By Fritz Blanke. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. 16.60 Swiss francs or 16 Deutsche Mark.

The professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Zürich since 1929 has supplied what seems to me to be a really inciting introduction to the mind of Johann Georg Hamann (1730–88), a mind the stimulating action of which is still, as he says, far from exhausting itself. The man he admirably sums up as follows: an independent thinker and writer, the author of a philosophy of language and a pioneer in aesthetics, the master of Herder and the quickener of Goethe, the adversary of Kant and Lessing, the friend of Lavater, Jacobi, and Matthias Claudius, and a leader in the battle that overcame the enlightenment.

Hamann was in no sense systematic, but amid his theological reflections Professor Blanke is able to distinguish what he calls four foci: 1, Everything spiritual, before it is apprehensible to human beings, takes on a sensory (visible or audible) and an apprehensible form, i.e. a body; 2, the coherence of creation; 3, the dependence of philosophy upon revelation; 4, justification by faith. With respect to the last, the strong tendency of the enlightenment was, Professor Blanke says, to look upon Luther as the pioneer in a progressive escape from dogma towards the stable refuge of reason. Hamann felt that this was simply to turn one's back upon Christianity, even though it might be unawares. It was the bone of his contention with Lessing; for Lessing took Luther to be a rebel from tradition and a man who would brook no restraining hand from external authority, content as he was to rely exclusively upon God and his own conscience. But to Hamann the picture was a travesty. He was certain that Luther threw off allegiance to the pope only the more thoroughly to submit to Scripture. It is above all Hamann, Professor Blanke says, who preserved the evangelical faith from being corrupted by the rationalism of his age.

Hamann's philosophy of language is consonant with his sense of the community of spirit and body. In his day speculation on the origin of language was popular, and he opposed it; for the speculation was invariably naturalistic. The prevalent view of God in the enlightenment was as pure thought, and all discourse of heavenly things had accordingly to be abstract. Hamann pointed out that in

the Bible God had very evidently adapted his form of expression to the understanding of the crowd. God had condescended to man (the term is in Clement of Alexandria, in Hilary and in Augustine), and it was in recounting trivial and contemptible happenings, and even silly and sinful actions, that the Bible was able to entertain our human susceptibility to mystery and marvel. Man had not made the word; on the contrary, the word had made man. God spoke first, and thereupon men needed only to hear, to mark and to learn.

Six essays are collected to form the volume, *Hamann-Studien*. Incidentally, the lecture on Hamann and Socrates, issued on its own at Constance in 1954, is not one of them. Five were first published between the beginning of 1928 and the end of 1931; that is to say, long before the publication not only of the two volumes of the Ziesemer-Henkel edition of Hamann letters (1955–56), but also of Joseph Nadler's *Complete Works of J. G. Hamann* in five volumes (1949–53), and yet it is only the sixth essay, written much more recently, which has been revised. It seems indeed as though Professor Blanke had years ago thought himself into the heart of Hamann's teaching. And we may surmise how this happened. It is not to make English readers any the less grateful to Professor Gregor Smith, Dr Walter Lowrie, and Professor O'Flaherty to say that he never mentions the word "romantic" or the word "existential", and likewise never names Kierkegaard. He has been more direct. He began to write these essays during what he calls "three rich, unforgettable years"—1926 to 1929—when he was a lecturer in Hamann's own native Koenigsberg. Apparently in that ancient city he was able to imagine him in his contemporary setting; for he makes him live.

Peterborough. Montgomery Belgion.

Till we have Faces. By C. S. Lewis. Geoffrey Bles. 15s.

Mr Lewis gives one more proof of his versatility in a novel that combines something of characteristics from his earlier space-travel and the fairy-land of Narnia with a classical theme re-embroidered to his own pattern. *Till we have Faces* is a re-telling of the myth of Psyche with significant changes from the version in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, not least in the ascription of invisibility to Psyche's mountain palace and a consequent re-valuation in the character and motives of her sisters. The story is told by the eldest sister, Orual, first princess and then queen of Glome, an outlandish and barbarous kingdom on the fringes of Greek civilization—and thus a culture abounding in the outlandish names and barbarous ways which Mr Lewis can handle with such relish. Istra, Psyche in Greek, third and lovely daughter of King Trom, is idolized by her ugly, forceful eldest sister, and when she is exposed on a mountain-side to propitiate the jealousy of Ungit (Aphrodite's name in Glome), Orual searches for her remains and finds Psyche in what she claims to be her palace, gift of the husband she claims to be a god. Then, as in the myth, the smuggled lamp, the awakened Cupid and the banishment of Psyche.

Then the story deepens, becoming an increasingly earnest and savage quest of Orual to unmask the gods, to unveil their mystery, to make them declare themselves. Part I closes on a cry of defiance: "I say, therefore, that there is no creature (toad, scorpion or serpent) so noxious to man as the gods. Let them answer my charge if they can. It may well be that, instead of answering, they'll strike me mad or leprous or turn me into beast, bird or tree. But will not all the world then know (and the gods will know it knows) that this is because they have no answer."

In Part II, Orual writes an epilogue to her defiance, for strange things are happening in her embittered heart. Inexorably driven by a deepening knowledge of her self and of the mysterious world which presses in upon her in vision and oracle and pain, the strong old queen dies on the threshold of understanding. Mr Lewis closes his tale in fine passages, reminiscent of the mystic transports at the close of *The Golden Ass,* but shot through with a knowledge that Apuleius was never vouchsafed, that man was at last to have a face, when he saw his true nature revealed in the only true Man.

Oliver Tomkins.

Lincoln.

SHORTER NOTICES

Planning a Year's Pulpit Work. By Andrew W. Blackwood. St Andrew Press. 18s.

Principles and Practice of Preaching. A comprehensive study of the art of sermon construction. By Ilion T. Jones. Abingdon Press. 32s.

Exposition and Encounter. Preaching in the Context of Worship. By James S. Stewart. Berean Press. 2s.

For too long there was a tendency to isolationism in British theology. It is to be hoped that that is breaking down, not only in our approach to Continental theology, but also to American. Niebuhr, Tillich and a dozen others have taught us to look across the Atlantic with profit. It is to be hoped that in the sphere of Homiletics we in the British Isles are alert to the contribution which American theologians and preachers are making. If we are not, it is to our great loss. Nor need we look *back* only, for example to the days of Phillips Brooks and his great ministry at Philadelphia, Boston and elsewhere. Much is being done and written in America to-day to which we should do well to give heed.

In the U.S.A. the name of Andrew W. Blackwood is known as that of a veteran in the teaching and practice of preaching. Now Professor Emeritus of Homiletics at Princeton Theological Seminary, he has written extensively over a long period and his work always shows

signs of wide and up-to-date reading. It will be a disadvantage to Anglicans reading his *Planning a Year's Pulpit Work* that he writes as a non-Episcopalian, for his Church Year is only in the broad sense ours. But it would be foolish to dismiss the book for that reason alone. There is in it a great deal of material which would be highly useful for any one of us who is engaged in the holy craft of preaching. For not only is the material in itself valuable and suggestive; the whole accent of the book is healthy, for it is on *planning*, and planning well in advance of delivery. How much homiletic work to-day fails to achieve much just because it has no carefully planned strategy behind it! It consists of a long series of arrows shot into the air, and falling to earth we know not where!

Dr Ilion T. Jones's book, *Principles and Practice of Preaching*, again is written by a non-Episcopalian, but it is crammed full of material which will be of the greatest use to preachers of all denominations. This book, really digested by men newly ordained or older men in need of a refresher course in preaching, might well revolutionize a preaching ministry. Fully documented, with many a shaft of humour and an extensive bibliography, this is the kind of book I should like to put into the hands of all my clerical friends (if it did not cost 32s.!). The centrality of preaching to worship is a theme on which most text-books are lamentably weak, but there is some good material on it here (though the relation of Word to Sacrament is not worked out as it should be).

Little need be said about J. S. Stewart's *Exposition and Encounter: Preaching in the Context of Worship*, for in the realm of Homiletics Stewart's work is some of the most lively in British theological writing, and this Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture is no exception. Here he is concerned with expository preaching as being a means by which men and women encounter God in Christ. "That is why preaching is itself an integral part of worship. The aim of exposition is encounter." Again we have no reasoned working out of the relation of the Sacrament of the Word to the Gospel Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, but perhaps that was hardly the purpose of the lecture.

Bishopscroft,
Bradford.

Donald Bradford.

The Journal of Ecclesiastical History. October, 1956. Faber and Faber. 18s.

This journal, which is at present published twice yearly, maintains a remarkably high standard both in its articles and in its book reviews. The October number includes articles on "Imposition of Hands in Confirmation: a medieval problem," by H. M. J. Banting, and on "St Richard of Chichester," by E. F. Jacob. Everyone interested in church history of whatever period should keep an eye on it.

PAST FINDING OUT. THE TRAGIC STORY OF JOANNA SOUTHCOTT AND HER SUCCESSORS. By G. R. Balleine. S.P.C.K. 15s. 6d.

"London is doomed, unless the Bishops open Joanna's Box"; so ran enormous placards in the Underground before the Great War. But who was Joanna? She was a devout farmer's daughter from Devon, born in 1750, self-reliant, well drilled in Bible and catechism (her father was churchwarden), with no more than the usual dose of village superstition. At the age of forty-two she heard a voice saying, "The Lord is awakened out of sleep. He will terribly shake the earth". She felt compelled to write down what the voice said, and found her hand guided to compose hundreds of lines in doggerel verse foretelling the future. She believed that she was a prophetess, and was much encouraged when she heard an Advent sermon by the Vicar of St Kew in Exeter Cathedral warning his hearers that the Great Assize might soon begin. Joanna took these words at their face value and assured the preacher that she was sent to foretell the day of the Lord in detail. The Vicar of St Kew was unconvinced, but Joanna handed him a sealed letter saying, "As you doubt by what Spirit I am led, be pleased to keep this until the end of the year. Then you will judge of its truth". It contained a prediction that Bishop Butler of Exeter, who was then in perfect health, would not live until Christmas. On 12 December he died.

Those who knew Joanna best were convinced that she was sincere. Even when she claimed to be the Bride mentioned in Scripture, even when she started publishing her prophecies and attracting a nation-wide interest, sending out seals for believers to sign, she remained humble and self-questioning. She had a horror of the dishonest eccentrics her movement attracted, of whom the worst was Mary Bateman of Leeds, who claimed that her hens were laying eggs inscribed CRIST IS COMING and was finally hanged dressed in white for having sent to a critic arsenic powder "guaranteed to avert a great calamity", if mixed with the Sunday pudding. Joanna's own end was tragic. Meditating on the troublesome text that the sceptre should not depart from Judah "until Shiloh come", she became convinced early in 1814 that she was about to become Shiloh's mother, though she was then a spinster of sixty-four. More than thirty doctors, some the most eminent in London, examined her and declared that she was pregnant. Everything was prepared, including a satinwood crib costing £200. For Joanna the disillusion was terrible. She called her friends and declared of her mission, "Now it all appears delusion". She lost all desire to live and died in December 1814.

Mr Balleine is not content with giving a full account of the pathetic Joanna. He traces the fortunes of her followers down to the present day. The powers of some were remarkable: George Turner sentenced a choir to six months' silence for being boastful; John Wroe compelled his Ashton-under-Lyne followers to submit to circumcision, grow beards, wear claret-coloured clothes and learn Hebrew. English religion has not always been restrained and well behaved, the longing for authoritative biblical pronouncements and idealistic communities is not far below the surface. Mr Balleine has

succeeded in painting an attractive picture of Joanna Southcott and at the same time reminding us of the strange varieties of religious experience. He carries his learning lightly and gives us the most fantastic facts with a humane sympathy for his odd heroines and heroes.

A. B. Webster.

Barnard Castle.

Hebrew Man. By Ludwig Koehler. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

First published in German in 1953, this readable book attempts to portray the Hebrew man of the Old Testament period as a personality set in the physical and cultural context of his times. His physical appearance, his expectation of life, his health and food his *cursus vitae*, are all carefully discussed with the especial insights which Professor Koehler's extensive lexicographical knowledge richly affords. The two chapters on how the Hebrew thought are particularly valuable and remind us that when we repeat what Wheeler Robinson taught us about the quasi-physical terms like "heart" and "reins" we are a long way from dealing with Hebrew psychology. Professor Koehler discloses the thought-processes of the Hebrew in a way which before only Pedersen had attempted. His exposition of the *sodh* or council in which the boy grew up as in an educative society is especially interesting. There are small points where one feels that the author has built too largely on narrow foundations ("if a man had several wives, each was called the *ṣarah*, 'enemy, rival', from the point of view of the others"; the Hebrew "does not wish to be alone"—but cf. Ruth and Orpah, and Ps. 55. 6–7, or the instance of Elijah), but as a whole the book is a brilliant re-appraisal of largely familiar material and is remarkably successful in recreating for the reader the personality of Old Testament man. The translation is smooth and competently unobtrusive.

Nineveh and the Old Testament. By André Parrot. Translated by B. E. Hooke. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

This book is the third in the *Studies in Biblical Archeology* series, and brings into convenient compass the known facts concerning Nineveh as they relate to the Old Testament. These facts add a wealth of detail to the narratives in the Book of Kings and illuminate the history of Israel to the end of the seventh century B.C. Well illustrated, the book is to be highly commended both for the general reader and for the more serious student of the Bible.

S. B. Frost.

McGill University,
Montreal.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES AND THE MIND OF PAUL. By Donald Guthrie. Tyndale Press. 1s. 6d.

It is generally taken for granted in circles which accept the principles of criticism that the three Pastoral Epistles, while incorporating a few fragments or notes of the apostle, are substantially the work only of a devoted disciple; and the arrogance and abusive tone adopted by some conservative scholars who have written on this subject have hardly helped to re-establish the traditional view. The present essay, however, is at once more modest in its claims ("we have endeavoured to show that the Pauline authorship, although not without its difficulties, seems to be at least as credible as the Paulinist theory") and unexpectedly persuasive in argument. The author was not able to take into account, except in some footnotes, Dr P. N. Harrison's recent defence of his classical *Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (1921), but some of his objections to the Harrison thesis are very telling. Are we entitled to refuse St Paul another 306 words in his working vocabulary—especially if it can be shown that the peculiar words of the Pastorals are anyhow mostly known in other writings of the first century? Is it not reasonable to suppose that stylistic changes might be due to the old age of St Paul, just as similar changes can certainly be discerned in the works of Plato and Shakespeare? Other changes of emphasis and expression are due to the character of the readers and to the subjects dealt with. Allusions to other epistles of St Paul *may* denote a disciple who was saturated in St Paul's thought; but could not the apostle have been saturated in his own thought? There are certain psychological difficulties about the various motives that have to be attributed to the Pastor: did he really try to make Paul address the contemporary (second century) ecclesiastical situation in order to provide a framework for "several brief personal notes sent by the real Paul to the real Timothy and Titus" (Harrison)?

This lecture should not be overlooked. Coupled with Fr Spicq's monumental commentary, it cannot but shake the confidence of those of us who have hitherto accepted the Harrison-Easton (though the latter is doubtful about any genuine fragments) hypothesis. And, incidentally, if St Paul *did* write these epistles, then the earliest reference to apostolic succession (in the sense of "the creation of a bishop by a *samakh* on the part of one who is a bishop already"—Daube) is carried back to . . . an apostle.

WILFRID BROWNING.

CUDDESDON COLLEGE.

ANGELS UNAWARES. A one-act play by Stuart B. Jackman. S.C.M. Press. 4s.

This is an interesting play, written in the direct style of the so-called "straight play", but relating the action throughout to its religious significance in the person of the strange scapegoat Jew. The theme is a contemporary one. It shows the dilemma of the decent honest working man who has joined the "party" in the hopes of

building a better world, finding himself supporting the scoundrels of his own "party" against the other sort of scoundrel of the employer. Peter Fisher and his wife and daughter are equally at the mercy of the boss Ferrars and of their own colleague Harry Grimshaw, and in the end the stranger Jew is sacrificed. The religious significance is obvious, perhaps too obvious, and I think the play would have been even better if the meaning had been more latent, and it had been left to the audience to experience for themselves the shock of recognition. However, dramatically it is good, tense and lively; and though the interest may be too topical, like Galsworthy's "Strife", I think it will be of lasting interest.

MARY HAMPDEN-JACKSON.

OXFORD.

DUNCAN-JONES OF CHICHESTER. By S. C. Carpenter. Mowbray. 11s. 6d.

This might have proved an unnecessary book in unskilful hands, but, the author being a life-long friend and brother-in-law of the subject as well as an accomplished writer, success is assured. Duncan-Jones was endowed with a fine presence, a majestic voice, singleness of heart and fundamental simplicity, and a versatile mind. Like everyone else he had limitations, which are gracefully hinted at here. The interest of the biography lies in the Dean's wide range of interests: music and the Church Music Society, liturgy and the Alcuin Club (of these two bodies he was chairman), and, above all, in his later years, the contacts of the Church of England with foreign Churches. These involved political judgments, and he became an impassioned "anti-Red" in his advocacy of freedom and seemed to favour war as a means of liberating countries from Communism; at least, that was the logical deduction from his speeches. He was a strong supporter of the 1928 Liturgy, which he induced the Chapter to agree should be in regular use in Chichester Cathedral, and was disappointed that the example found little or no following in the diocese. Two sides of his work, to which he attached much importance, are not described here. The first is the friendly co-operation between the cathedral and the city, to which he contributed much: the outward sign of this was the dinner given by the Mayor and Corporation to the members of the cathedral foundation in November 1954, in recognition of his silver jubilee as dean. The other is the new statutes of the cathedral, to the drafting and revision of which he gave some years of intermittent work. He was particularly proud of the plan he introduced by which members of the Greater Chapter acted as residentiaries during the summer months. The full account of the Chichester Use needs supplementing on one point. Generally speaking, it remains the standard of worship, but is not followed in every particular.

One statement made by Dr Carpenter needs correction. He says that the group of Liberal Catholic Cambridge theologians with whom Duncan-Jones as a young man was associated "eventually produced"

(with help) *Essays Catholic and Critical* (1926). The origin of the book was this. The English Church Union and the S.P.C.K. planned a volume of theological essays, with an editorial staff of five. The arrangement fell through and Dr Selwyn became sole editor. He chose his contributors and naturally included some of his old friends, who did not form a majority of the team. There was no thought, so far as I know, of producing a manifesto of the Cambridge group.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Chichester.

The Buddha, the Prophet, and the Christ. By F. H. Hilliard. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Dr Hilliard, the author of *Man in Eastern Religions*, here sets out to trace in the canonical writings of Buddhism, Islam and Christianity the growth of a belief that the Founder was more than man. He gives us an interesting and scholarly survey of the relevant passages from the Scriptures of the three religions. In the case of Buddhism and Islam, he strains the evidence in the direction of exaggerating both the divinization of the Founder and resemblances to the Church's tradition of Christ. He glosses over the fact that there is virtually no trace in the Qu'ran, as distinct from the Traditions of two centuries or so later, of a view of the Prophet as more than man. His presentation of Sakyamuni, while firmly based in Buddhist tradition, is poles apart from that of modern Buddhists (such as in this country Mr Christmas Humphreys): and the latter seem to us much more faithful to original Buddhism. It is not irrelevant that the earliest Buddhist Scriptures date from about five centuries after Gautama. When he comes to Christianity, he does not attempt to distinguish between an original tradition which does not regard Jesus as more than a purely human teacher, and a later tradition which regards him as Word made Flesh. The assumption seems to be that the historic Jesus was no more than man: but Dr Hilliard does not begin to discuss the difficulties of such an assumption. With all respect for Dr Hilliard's learning and his sympathetic attitude to the non-Christian religions, we are not convinced by him. We prefer to follow the Buddhists and Muslims in regarding the founders of Buddhism and Islam as great religious teachers who neither claimed to be, nor were, more than human: and to follow the Christians in regarding their Master as God become man.

G. F. S. Gray.

St Augustine's College,
Canterbury.

The Redemption of Thinking. By Rudolf Steiner. Translated and edited by A. P. Shepherd and Mildred Robertson Nicoll. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

This is a book by two students of Steiner, whom one is tempted to call over-enthusiastic admirers, expounding three of his lectures on

Thomas Aquinas. It is a little difficult for an ordinary mortal to follow the workings of Rudolf Steiner's mind because he apparently claimed for himself, and the editors of this book claim for him, that revelations denied to the rest of mankind were made to that mind: "From his earliest childhood he had a fully conscious and unbroken experience of super-sensible reality . . . his mind was bent on one aim, the discovery of the relationship between the world of reality which he shared with others and that which he alone experienced" (p. 172). One is irritated by Steiner's high-handed treatment of philosophers with whom he disagrees, e.g. "It is quite plain that Kant himself never saw the point with which my books make a serious attempt to deal" (p. 105). However, it has to be remembered that Steiner has a right to be regarded as something of a genius, that he read and understood Kant at a remarkably early age and that he says in *The Mission of Folk-Souls* (p. 143), "I beg of you to accept nothing I have ever said or ever shall say, on or in blind faith". Steiner's crusade to redeem modern thinking from barren intellectualism and to devote it to spiritual apprehension and his consideration of the methods of Thomas Aquinas in the connexion must be taken seriously.

The thinking of the epilogue and appendices of the book, written by the editors and translators, requires some redemptive activity. The blue pencil is needed for such expressions as "the Christian belief in the immortality of the soul" (p. 145) and "Theosophy resented the exclusive claims of organized Christianity and its attitude towards other religions as 'false'" (p. 134). In the appendix on Dionysius the Areopagite we are confused because at one moment Steiner is described as treading both of the "Two Paths" and then "the track between the two paths". One wonders whether the compilers of this book are the best qualified to interpret Steiner to the English mind.

RAMSDEN, OXFORD. J. C. S. NIAS.

A REASON FOR THE HOPE. Foreword by the Bishop of London. Mowbrays. 7s. 6d.

PROGRESSIVE RELIGION. By E. K. Ellis. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

THE PASSION DRAMA. By Hugh Bishop, C.R. Hodder and Stoughton. 3s. 6d.

In the book to which Dr Wand supplies the Foreword there are twelve study schemes covering a detailed consideration of the Apostles' Creed. Each scheme gives guidance in Prayer, Bible Study, Reading and Discussion. The late Dr Garbett, writing of the Church of England, pointed out that "there are many of its own members who know neither the faith of the Church, nor the reasons for holding it". Whilst *A Reason for the Hope* is not a book to be recommended to every "man in the pew", it is a course of detailed, reasoned, prayerful study to be led by someone who already knows "a reason for the hope". It should be ideal in senior study groups

and in lay readers' study circles and, indirectly, might bring new life and vision to the parish priest's annual confirmation classes.

The title of Canon Ellis's book gives the key to the matter in hand. The need for progress and movement. So often, the Christian strives to reach a certain height or standard of churchmanship and, having got there, feels settled and secure. A reading of *Progressive Religion* might convince many that they have never really got there or that they need a continued effort to remain there or make real progress.

Having heard Fr Bishop deliver his talks I felt that something essential was lacking as I read *The Passion Drama*. Nevertheless, despite this absence of a vocal personality, the author does achieve his aim—"to make the Passion more real in the everyday lives of ordinary Christians and to remind them that we are all actors, not merely spectators, in this drama".

JOHN L. BADGER

WEST ACKLAM,
MIDDLESBROUGH.

THE ACTS OF THE PAGAN MARTYRS (ACTA ALEXANDRINORUM). Edited with commentary by Herbert A. Musurillo, S.J. Clarendon Press. 35s.

The *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* represent a literary *genre* which flourished in the first two centuries of our era. They represent an upsurge of Alexandrian feeling against Rome, in which educated Greeks were moved to protest against the mismanagement of their affairs by a "barbarian" power which showed undue favour to the Jews in the inter-racial conflicts of that troubled city. The emperors could not brook these outspoken and sometimes insolent protests. For about the past fifty years these *Acta* have given rise to a considerable literature dealing with their origin and historicity; in this literature works in English have not figured to any great extent, though there is an excellent general account of the *Acta* by Sir H. I. Bell in the somewhat inaccessible *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* for 1950. We have now, however, this carefully prepared edition in which Dr Musurillo has assembled all the texts, down to the merest scraps of papyrus, and has written an erudite commentary, with an English translation. The texts are the important thing, and we have to turn to the appendices for discussion of the tradition of "martyr" literature, of possible sources in various literary forms and modes of thought, and of the controversy surrounding the historicity of the documents. The book is an excellent work, on which the editor is to be warmly congratulated. For students of early church history the question whether there is any connexion between these *Acta* and the *Acta* of the Christian martyrs is an interesting and even important one. Dr Musurillo holds that there is none, but this is perhaps a subject on which the last word has not yet been said.

J. STEVENSON.

DOWNING COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. By Georgia Harkness. Abingdon Press. $2.75.

Professor Harkness's book can be commended as a clear, informative and interesting synopsis of the main problems which are exercising the minds of theologians to-day concerning the sources and norms of Christian belief, the recent history of thought which has led to the emergence of the problems in their modern form, the divergent answers which are being given to them and their relation to one another. The area covered in 153 pages is so wide—comprising, along with other themes, Philosophy and Theology, Theology and Scientific Method, Revelation, Faith and Knowledge, the Authority of the Bible—that anything in the way of a thoroughgoing exploration of the problems is not to be expected, and Professor Harkness could hardly have had it in mind to conduct such an exploration. Rather she has provided what to many, especially perhaps students, will prove a most useful introduction to "theology to-day"; indeed, in one or two places her pages read almost like the sort of synopsis that are sometimes issued by conscientious teachers to their pupils. Despite a hint here and there of superficiality, one never loses the sense of being in touch with a lively and vigorous mind, which has a wide knowledge of the field, and with a religious spirit which is both devout and able. Professor Harkness does not conceal her own theological views, and these have both the merit and the interest of being aware of the questions which might be asked by those whose viewpoint is different.

H. H. FARMER.

CAMBRIDGE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

COLLINS: Nels F. S. Ferré, *Strengthening the Spiritual Life* (6s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Frederic Greeves, *The Meaning of Sin* (21s.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: Douglas Webster, *In Debt to Christ: a study of the meaning of the Cross* (4s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Gordon Powell, *The Blessing of Belief* (7s. 6d.).

LABOR ET FIDES (GENEVA): Jacques de Senarclens, *Héritiers de la Réformation: le point de départ de la foi* (n.p.).

MOWBRAY: Richard Tatlock, *In My Father's House* (3s. 6d.); Racine, *Confessions: Unpublished Sonnets* [Translated into English verse by Walter Roberts] (13s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Helen Gardner, *The Limits of Literary Criticism* (5s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Lesslie Newbigin, *Sin and Salvation* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: C. M. Chavasse, *Walking with Christ* (1s. 6d.); Michael Bruce, *The Science of Prayer* [new edition] (12s. 6d.).

WAGNER (NEW YORK) and HERDER (LONDON): John E. Steinmueller and Kathryn Sullivan, *Catholic Biblical Encyclopedia* (Old and New Testaments) (£6).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

The Will and the Way

Harry Blamires **15s. net**

In what ways does God act to-day upon the human scene? What is the nature of his interference in our daily lives? The modern mind regards such questions as starting-points for discussion, as mental cocktails to loosen tongues and stimulate brains. But the Christian Faith has clear answers, if we are prepared to find that He whom we asked to advise, help and strengthen, come to indwell, command, direct. The book has the sub-title, *A Study of Divine Providence and Vocation.*

S · P · C · K

★ BOOKS ★

BIBLICAL STUDIES
CHURCH HISTORY, PATRISTICS
BYZANTIUM, MEDIEVAL LATIN
SCHOLASTICISM, PALAEOGRAPHY
ART, &c.

•

British and American, European and Oriental
Second-hand and New. Catalogues free

•

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD, Petty Cury, Cambridge

The New Testament Background
Selected Documents

C. K. Barrett — **21s. net**

A selection of documents, in translation and with notes, throwing light on the background against which the events of the New Testament took place.

Christ and his Church

A. Nygren — **10s. 6d. net**

A study in the idea of the Messiahship of Jesus in the New Testament and its basis in the Old, and of the significance of the idea for our understanding of the nature of the Church by the distinguished Swedish theologian, author of *Agape and Eros* and other standard works.

Durham Essays and Addresses

A. M. Ramsey — **12s. 6d. net**

'This is Anglicanism at its best.' CANON ROGER LLOYD: *Manchester Guardian.*

Pastoral Theology

Martin Thornton — **25s. net**

'This is a revolutionary book. . . . Nowhere has this point of view been so thoroughly investigated at the levels of metaphysics, psychology, ascetic theology. Mr. Thornton has an acute and sometimes withering scorn, and original and vital intuitions.' *Times Literary Supplement.*

Current Problems of the Church

A. E. J. Rawlinson — **5s. net**

'Like everything he writes, the book is marked by charity and lucidity and expresses his real concern about Christian disunity.' *British Weekly.*

S · P · C · K